

The Converted Catholic.

A Monthly Publication

Specially designed for the Enlightenment and Conversion
of Roman Catholics.

Edited and Published by Father O'Connor, at 60 Bible House, New York.

JANUARY, 1885.

Vol. II. No. 2.

Subscription \$1.00 per annum.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes.....	33	Conversion of a Scotch Roman Catholic Priest.....	43
Reformed Catholic Church :		Celibacy and Morality :	
The Work in New York.....	34	Priestly Crimes.....	43
The Work in Brooklyn.....	36	Canadian Clerical Scandals... ..	44
The Work in Newark.....	37	Was the Apostle Peter Ever in Rome ?.....	45
Pastors Chiniquy and Cote... ..	37	Father Chiniquy's Persecutors....	50
The Conversion of Priests (a sample case).....	38	Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal McClosky (second series)..	54
The Priest Another Christ.....	39	Rome : Pagan and Papal (continued).....	60
Converts from Rome :			
Rev. John A. McGreaham....	40		
Dan'l O'Connor's Experience	41		
Don't Fear Excommunication	42		
Prof. Wm. S. Courtney.....	43		

"MY SOUL DOTH MAGNIFY THE LORD,
AND MY SPIRIT HATH REJOICED IN GOD
MY SAVIOUR."—*The Virgin Mary.*

EDITORIAL NOTES.

WE wish it were possible to take all our readers by the hand and wish them "A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year." As this cannot be, we send them our heart-felt greeting at this season of rejoicing, with our fervent

prayers that God might bless them each and all during the year 1885.

WE have 100 copies of the CONVERTED CATHOLIC for last year (Vol. I.), handsomely bound in cloth. Price \$1.00. Send orders before they are all gone.

THE beautiful and instructive article, "The Portrait of Mary in Heaven," which appeared in our last issue,

has been printed in a 36-page tract for distribution. Price 6 cents ; 20 copies for \$1.00.

So much interest has been created by the first series of "Letters to Cardinal McCloskey," that we have been actually compelled to begin a new series, which we do in this issue. The Cardinal may not like this, but we cannot help it.

The first series of letters can be had at this office. Price 35 cents, paper cover ; 50 cents, cloth.

WE have many subscribers who could increase our circulation if they called the attention of their friends to our special field of labor. Sunday-school libraries, Young Men's Christian Associations and public reading-rooms should be supplied with the CONVERTED CATHOLIC. Let it be a preacher and educator to the large number of Roman Catholics who frequent such places. Subscriptions for this purpose will bear fruit in due season.

RENEW your own subscription and get us one more subscriber among your friends. Make your pastor a present of the CONVERTED CATHOLIC for the year 1885.

REFORMED CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Work in New York.

After preaching for a year in a church which was rented from a Presbyterian congregation on Twenty-fifth street, New York, services have been resumed in the large hall of the Masonic Temple, Sixth avenue and Twenty-third street. It is always dif-

ficult to keep a congregation together when the place of meeting has to be changed frequently. But, until a permanent building is secured, it is necessary to select the most accessible places that can be had at a moderate rent. On account of its location in the heart of the city, Masonic Temple is the best place for services of this nature. For three years services were held there, and many precious souls were brought into the light.

Sunday evening, Dec. 7th, 1884, was made memorable by the presence of three sisters, who had been recently inmates of convents. The eldest, who had been a nun, united with the Reformed Catholic Church a year ago, and soon afterwards developed the usual zeal of all converts. She wanted all the inmates of the convent to share in her freedom and in her happy Christian experience. When she first arose to speak in the prayer meeting, the timidity and fear begotten of long seclusion in a convent prevented her from uttering more than a few words expressive of her happiness in trusting in Jesus as her Saviour. Afterwards she felt that her testimony must take the form of work, practical work, for the deliverance of her friends from the spiritual slavery of the Roman Catholic Church. She had two young sisters in the "Convent of the Sisters Marianites of Holy Cross" (we give the full title), situated at No. 215 West Thirty-ninth street, New York, and immediately set about removing them from that institution. The nuns threw every obstacle in her way, but her faith in God and her longing for the deliverance of her sisters gave her wisdom in overcoming all difficulties. Father O'Connor introduced the three sisters

to the congregation on the Sunday evening mentioned, and they were cordially welcomed by all present. The oldest of the two he has placed in care of the Young Women's Christian Association, who will provide her with a good home. The youngest he hopes to be able to send to a Christian school or academy, if he can find one where she will receive tuition free. On Sunday Dec. 28th, he formally received them into the Church on profession of faith in Jesus Christ as their Saviour; and after a formal renunciation of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, he presented each of them with a copy of the Bible.

Father O'Connor then gave a brief account of the year's work, showing that during the year he had given the hand of fellowship to fifty persons who had been Roman Catholics, making nearly 400 in all whom he had received during the last six years. Those persons resided in widely-scattered parts of the city, and many of them had since united with evangelical churches near their homes. He counselled them to do this in all cases where they resided at too great a distance from their own place of meeting. In this number were included all the members of five families, three who had been educated for the priesthood, six who had been educated in convents, and two who had been Protestants, but were led into Romanism, and now expressed their desire to return to the good old paths of the Bible. From the very nature of such a work as this, those who joined it were persons of strong convictions who did not shrink from persecution for conscience sake; and many of them had suffered loss in their business. Many Protestants attended the

services, and if the preaching were no better than could be heard in other churches, it was at all events uncompromising in opposition to the false doctrines of the Church of Rome. The way of holiness to the Lord has been pointed out to all in so plain a manner that even the wayfaring man should not err therein. Every convert from the Roman Church has been a victory for Christ, and through these services the Lord has wiped away tears from off many faces that were never Catholic.

During the year, collections have been taken up at all meetings, but the amount realized from them did not pay half the rent. Those who attend regularly pay all they can; but from the very nature of a mission work of this kind the regular attendants are poor people. Truly can it be said of this Reformed Catholic movement that the poor have the Gospel preached to them. The work is carried on altogether by the voluntary contributions of all Christians whom the good God directs to help it. It is a work of faith in which the "children of the world" do not share, but which makes glad the hearts of all the "children of God" who participate in it.

The prospects for the new year were bright and happy, because the faith of the laborers in this evangelistic field was firmer, more steadfast, and better grounded on the rock of salvation, Jesus Christ himself, than at any period during the last six years. The Lord and His truth will prevail over wickedness and superstition, and the reward of those who hasten that day will be great.

Father O'Connor in closing the service paid a warm tribute of acknowledgment for the assistance of Rev. William D. Fox and his three brothers (all converts from the Roman Church) in the meetings during the year. The Rev. Dr. Mason Gallagher preached the sermon on this occasion, and warmly congratulated the pastor and people on this happy meeting at the close of the year.

The Work in Brooklyn.

The third anniversary of the opening of the mission of the Reformed Catholic Church in the Masonic Temple, Grand and Seventh streets, Brooklyn, was celebrated Nov. 25, 1884. The attendance was quite large. Seated on the platform were Revs. James A. O'Connor, James F. McNamee, the pastor, George R. Kramer, Stephen T. Dekins and Mr. E. P. Ide, the precentor, and member of the Young Men's Christian Association. The Rev. Mr. Kramer opened the meeting with prayer, and the Rev. Mr. O'Connor presided and made introductory remarks. The Rev. Mr. Fox, of Greenpoint, was introduced as a man every member of whose family had left the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Fox read the Scriptures.

The Rev. Mr. O'Connor spoke first. He said that it was cause for rejoicing and giving thanks to Almighty God that they met there freed from the yoke of Popery and the bondage of sin. Every man who had sinned should have a plain way of reaching Christ, who died for them at Calvary to purchase for them a right to kneel before Him, and not to the Pope of Rome or any of his priests. There was a plain, simple way of salvation for simple men, and that was to appeal directly to the Saviour. The speaker referred to the conversions among the English Episcopal ministry to the Church of Rome and how they were heralded to the world from time to time with a great flourish of trumpets. These men are now gradually going back to the Anglican Church, but there was no mention made of the fact in the public press. He spoke of the Rev. Pierce

Connolly of Canada, who joined the Roman Catholic Church and was admitted to the priesthood, while his wife became a nun. Mr. Connolly went back to the Anglican Church, but his wife is a nun in Rome to-day, separated from him, and restrained of her liberty by the Papal powers. Referring to the work of the Reformed Catholic Church, he said that the doctrine they preached was satisfying to the soul, and there has not a single member of the church in six years left it to return to the Roman Church. The preacher read a letter from the Rev. John J. Casey, B.D., pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Montreal. The writer said that he had formerly resided in New York, had been a Roman Catholic and attended a Jesuit seminary, but subsequently went to Princeton seminary and Montreal. Irishmen should learn that the true way to be free was to be first free from the Romish yoke of bondage; then they could become free children of God.

The Rev. Denis Murphy, D.D., presiding elder of the M. E. Conference, of Iowa, who in his younger days was a Catholic, wrote that the growing indifference of the young men of the Roman Catholic Church to its teachings makes an opening for the good missionary work of the Reformed Catholic Church.

The Rev. J. F. McNamee, the pastor of the mission, gave a history of the Reformed Church of Brooklyn, and pronounced its efforts highly successful spiritually. In three years, through his efforts, over 100 persons renounced the Roman Catholic faith and now belong to different Protestant churches.

The Rev. George R. Kramer, Rev. Stephen Dekins, pastor of the Reformed Catholic Church, Newark, and Mr. Ide also spoke.

TO OUR VENERABLE BROTHER, FATHER CHINIQUE, we tender our heartfelt sympathy. He has been attacked by Roman Catholic mobs in Canada three times during the past year. The eloquent sermon on the subject by Rev. Dr. Casey (himself a convert from the Roman Catholic Church), will command attention.

PASTOR COTE, SUPERINTENDENT OF the French Missions in Massachusetts, is very busy establishing Missions in that State. The French Canadians are evidently as much opposed to the Gospel of Christ as the Irish Catholics are. In Fall River, Pastor Cote's meetings have been disturbed, but the city authorities interfered and prevented a repetition of the outrages.

The Work in Newark.

The fifth anniversary of the Reformed Catholic Church, Newark, N.J., was observed with appropriate exercises on Wednesday evening Dec. 3, 1884. There was a large attendance, and addresses were delivered by Rev Dr. Fulton, of Brooklyn; Rev. Dr. Craven, of Newark; Rev. Dr. Kramer, Rev. Dr. Findley, Father O'Connor, Father McNamee and the pastor of the church, the Rev. Stephen Dekins. The last named in the course of his remarks said:

"It is now nearly five years since I came to the city of Newark, having selected it as a field in which to labor

for the enlightenment and conversion of my Roman Catholic brethren, and thus far God has blessed us with encouraging success. Many Romanists have abandoned the superstitions of Rome and embraced the pure, simple doctrines of salvation as it is in Jesus Christ. There are also many Protestants, so-called, who have been made better through our weak efforts. I have been encouraged by the spiritual success which has attended my labors, and have gone forward unflinchingly to the present hour. You will appreciate my position when I inform you that thus far I have lived a life of faith in God, as to my support, without any fixed salary and depending entirely upon the collections and contributions of benevolent friends to the cause. I have succeeded in keeping out of debt, and paying all demands incident to the work. But it has been by the closest management, self-denial and often distressing financial straits that I am now, by the blessing of Almighty God still in the field of moral strife against error, superstition and spiritual degradation. When I came to this city, with its 150,000 inhabitants, sitting like a Queen above the blue waters of Newark bay, my aim was to establish confidence not only among those to whom I preached, but the community at large, and in this, thank God, I have succeeded. The Presbyterian clergymen of this city endorsed me one year ago last April, and as far as I know the clergy of all denominations think well of me. I ask your prayers for this work that it may continue, and also that I may prove faithful, so that when my time shall come to leave for the Golden Shores I may receive the unfading palm for even unseen victories."

The Conversion of Priests.

A SAMPLE CASE.

In February last a gentleman in this State sent a subscription to the CONVERTED CATHOLIC for the Roman Catholic pastor of his town. Some months afterwards that priest wrote to us, saying:

"Your monthly magazine shows me that I am not the only one dissatisfied with the Roman Catholic religion. For some time I have had grave doubts against the faith of the Church of which I am a priest, and it is only since I received your Magazine that I have a glimpse of the truths of religion. My faith is against the Roman Catholic system, but there is much in Protestantism that I do not understand. I like your way of writing on controversial subjects. You will win many to the truth. Pray for me that light may enter my poor, darkened soul."

After several letters had passed between us, we communicated with the gentleman who ordered the Magazine. This is his answer:

"DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR: Your letter has been received, and you may be sure I was very much surprised on reading it. I rejoice at the workings of Providence in the case of Father — and yet I never felt so seriously about the conversion from Romanism of any person; for this case comes right home.

"Father — is a neighbor of mine. He called at my office this morning (the writer is a physician). He is a good-natured man, and I know of no reason to doubt his sincerity. I have never spoken to him directly on the subject of religion. I have always treated him kindly, and you may re-

member that I had the CONVERTED CATHOLIC sent to him. I am sorry to say that is all I have done, and I fear my faith for his conversion has been even less than that. How often do we see seed spring up where we have sown ever so carelessly.

"You ask me to inquire about him. There is no one here better acquainted with him than I am. He has lived quietly here, and has done his work as pastor so well that I think he will compare favorably with any Roman Catholic priest in the State. Of course I look at this matter with Protestant eyes. There are some priests who seem to be sour-tempered and unapproachable, while others are kind-hearted, and seem to want your friendship and sympathy, so that any Christian heart cannot help warming to them. Of the latter class is Father —; and after reading his letter, which you send me, I can see additional reasons why he desires to make the acquaintance of his Protestant neighbors. I earnestly hope and pray that a soul that seems so near the Kingdom may not fail to enter. Lord Jesus, help him to become steadfast. I thank you personally for encouraging him, and I wish you could take him under your instruction. Then perhaps he would return to preach the pure Gospel to the Roman Catholics, who are very numerous here—fully one-half the population in the district where he lives.

"Your suggestion that Father — should make a public renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith before his own congregation seems to me too exacting for one in his position. I have no doubt that he has lost faith in the doctrines of the Roman Catholic

Church—his letter shows that—but to make his change of belief known to his congregation is a difficult thing, and I fear would be fraught with danger to him personally, for his parishioners are very bigoted and ignorant. Let us first endeavor to lead him to Jesus, and the Holy Spirit will then prompt him how to take leave of his people."

We advised the priest to call on this gentleman and open his heart to him in full confidence. He did so, and has since been receiving instruction in the Word of God, for this physician is a devoted Christian. In a subsequent letter he writes: "Father — and I read and pray together frequently. He has advanced so far that he preaches Christ *only* to his people, saying nothing about 'the Church,' though he observes all the forms of the Roman Catholic service. Some of the spiritually-minded of his parishioners are well pleased with his preaching, but the others, the 'baser sort'—and I fear they are a majority—think his sermons have not the 'right ring' in them. He is a good man, and sincerely desires to serve God. The good Lord knows what will come of it all; I do not. Father — seems to me like the man who had been twenty-five years in prison, and was released at the expiration of his time. But everything in the outside world was so strange to him, he returned to the prison and begged the keeper to take him back. He found no kind hearts outside to welcome him. So our poor friend, though weary of the iniquity of Rome, hesitates and lingers at the outer door of his spiritual prison, and will not take the step that will bring him into the glorious light and liberty

of the children of God. He is worthy of all our sympathy and commiseration. If he could remain here, it would be the best thing he could do, until he shall receive power from on high. But already there are indications that his ways are not well pleasing to his bishop, and I fear he will be *pushed out*. Persons, whom he believes to be spies, occasionally visit him, and unless he possesses good fighting qualities, the wrath of Rome will soon fall on him. Let us pray earnestly for him.

W. H. H."

—

The Priest Another Christ.

Intelligent Roman Catholics, when twitted by their Protestant acquaintances with the many superstitions of their Church, deny them, and, like Peter, often swear that they know nothing about them. Will they deny that the priest is another Christ? Here is an extract from a funeral sermon preached Dec. 9, 1884, by Father Ryan of Washington, D.C., over the remains of Father Edward Brennan, pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Cumberland, Md., reported in the *Cumberland Daily News*, Dec. 10:

"The Church tells us that the priest is another Christ, and no matter how unworthily the priest fulfills the duties of his office, his life in many respects resembles the life of our Saviour while on earth. He is another Saviour, and his duty is to teach the way to heaven, and, like the Saviour, he offers up with anointed hands the same sacrifice as that made on Calvary." Every Christian will say this is blasphemy, but it is only a part of the regular course of instruction given to Roman Catholics.

CONVERTS FROM ROME.

The Rev. John A. McGreaham, Pastor of the Primitive Methodist Church, Lowell, Mass., is a converted Catholic who has been much blessed in his ministry. His own family, who are all natives of Ireland, have been led to follow his example, in renouncing the errors and superstitions of Rome and accepting Christ as the way, the truth and the life of their souls. All who love the Lord will rejoice that Brother McGreaham's ministry has been so fruitful as to add one hundred members to his church during the last year. Before his transfer to Lowell he was Pastor of the church in Pleasant Valley, Pa., and was a power for good among the miners of that region. Even the Roman Catholics respected him, for he had ever a kindly word for them, and his winning manner often led them into a friendly discussion of religious subjects. They learned from him the way of salvation through Christ alone, if they had never heard it before; and we are sure they did not, for no priest of Rome dare preach that sinners can be saved without the machinery that the Popes have set working in "the Church."

When Brother McGreaham invited us to Pleasant Valley, and we preached the word of salvation, and laid bare the false doctrines of Rome several times in Scranton, Pittston, Lackawanna, etc., the Roman Bishop O'Hara, of Scranton, became alarmed and issued instructions to his priests to counteract the "heretical preaching of the apostate O'Connor." The priests could do nothing, for they were losing the confidence of the people in all that region. As an offset to our preaching,

they imported a pervert from the Episcopal Church, an ex-minister named Cleave, a very poor man who is eking out a livelihood by pandering to the corrupted taste of the ignorant and bigoted Irish Roman Catholics by his vapid lectures against Protestantism. Referring to him, Brother McGreaham wrote to us prior to his departure from Pleasant Valley: "There is a man going through this region as champion of Romanism, who claims to be a 'convert' from the Episcopal Church, and that his field of labor lay in Columbus, Ohio. He seems to have but one lecture in favor of the Roman Church as against Protestantism, which he delivered in Pittston at fifteen cents admission to an audience entirely composed of Roman Catholics. The priests are taking him over the ground that you travelled, and he is confirming wavering Romanists in the faith of the 'holy Church;' but as a result of your labors there are some of them beyond 'confirmation.' The effects of your lectures and of your book ('Letters to Cardinal McCloskey') cannot be destroyed.

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again.

"This man's name is Egbert M. Cleave, though he may have changed it since he became a renegade to the Bible."

We believe this Mr. Cleave now lives in Germantown, Pa., and if we mistake not he sees his folly in following after the "Scarlet Woman" of Rome. The last we heard of him, he had delivered a lecture in Hartford, Conn., abusive of the Reformed Catholic priests, calling them "traitors," "renegades," "Judases," etc. Well, we can stand all that, seeing we are rewarded by many souls saved from sin and superstition.

DANIEL O'CONNOR'S EXPERIENCE.

The writer was born at Indian Orchard, Mass., in 1847. My parents were from County Clare, Ireland, and shortly after my birth, moved to Richmond, Va. In the basement of the Cathedral of that city I was taught my first lessons in prayers and the Catechism by the Christian brothers. For five years I attended the parish school, my parents intending me for the priesthood. Fortunately for me they moved to Mound City, Ill., and there for the first time I attended a public school. It was in this town I first went to confession to a priest. As I recall these scenes I tremble to think of the darkness and superstition that blinded me, and that now blind so many souls that might have light and peace. Every Roman Catholic is taught by parents and priest that the Church of Rome is the only true Church, and that the priest can curse and cure at will; but thank God I have found some Catholics who doubt the power of the priest.

In 1865, we came to St. Paul, Minn. I was then eighteen years old, and had read portions of the Bible, and this, with hearing priests and laymen talk of religion made me think that our religion was a queer one, for after mass the members would go direct to the nearest saloons to drink whiskey, and often to fight.

The idea that a man could forgive sins was my stumbling block. The more I thought of it, the more I doubted. I spoke to a priest about my doubts, and his answer was that I lacked faith. I doubted on two points chiefly: That the priests could forgive sins, and that St. Peter did

transmit his apostolic power to a Pope or that the Pope was St. Peter's successor. I pondered on these two points. I began to read the Bible with care, and, thank God, with profit. There is where priests have power over so many men and women. They tell their flocks that the Bible is not the rule of faith or the guide for their lives.

These doubts caused me much trouble. After being baptized and reared up in that faith it was hard to leave my father and mother, sisters and brother, who continued members of that Church. At last I concluded I would not believe in any form of religion, and for years I tried to be an infidel. I read all the infidel books I could find, but I found no peace. As I wandered in the fields of infidelity, the Roman Catholic Church and I forever parted. Still it was impossible for me to be at peace. I used to drink and swear, but these bad habits would be no detriment to a membership in the Roman Catholic Church. No other Church would receive me unless I reformed. I sometimes attended the Methodist Church, and I wanted to be a Christian. After a time I began to pray secretly for power to forsake my evil ways. I called upon God for help, and when I read the history of Him who came to save the sinner and the lost, I took courage. I prayed to Jesus more and more, and He did not turn me away. In His great heart I found a refuge that sheltered me from the sins of this world. I thank God for the gift of His only begotten Son who has made it possible for all to be saved from their sins. When I came to the point where I could say, "Lord, take me as I am, and save me a

sinner," I found the peace that passeth understanding. May God help the poor deluded Roman Catholics who do not know the Saviour, to break the chains of Rome's superstitions, and be free in the spirit of Christ. I made a strong effort one night in a congregation, and asked an interest in the prayers of God's people; and praise God, from that hour to this I know that my Saviour reigns in my heart, that He has forgiven my sins. I have been a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church for eight years, and my wife is also a member of that Church, and I have four children to cheer me on life's path.

My heart goes out in sympathy with the Reformed Catholic movement. It has a vast field to work in, and much good can and will be done through its instrumentality. There has been no movement since the days of Luther of so much importance to Roman Catholics. Christians of all denominations should encourage the good work. No one knows the workings of the Church of Rome in all its bearing, as well as a person who has been a Romanist; and that is why I wish to see our Catholic brethren delivered from such an ungodly system of religion. And I know that it never can be a benefit to this or any other country, any more than it can secure a soul admission to heaven by its masses and other idolatrous practices. There are many like myself who wish this cause God-speed, and who would help to sustain missions for the conversion of Romanists if they had the means. Here is an opportunity for the American people that should not be neglected. The Reformed Catholic pastors and this whole movement can reach Roman Catholics better than any other agency. May God bless and prosper all who in any wise help to make Jesus Christ the Saviour known to the blind followers of the Pope.

DANIEL O'CONNOR.
Farmington, Minn.

DON'T FEAR EXCOMMUNICATION.

"Dear Father O'Connor:

I am much pleased with the CONVERTED CATHOLIC, and it has helped me more than I can express. I am in great trouble because, according to your advice, I am searching the Scriptures to find the truth. I have been threatened by my people that if I leave the Roman Catholic Church, they will disinherit me, that the priest will excommunicate me from the Church during my life, and deprive me of Christian burial when I die. But I mean to live up to the light of the Gospel. Pray for me that the Lord may strengthen me in the contest that I see before me.

"Yours in the love of Christ.

"N. B. S."

Lassellsville, N. Y., Dec. 9, 1884.

"Let not your heart be troubled, dear brother. Continue to search the Scriptures, for in them you will find eternal life." If the priest who attends Lassellsville should excommunicate you, please let us know, and we will take such steps as will bring him to a knowledge of the right of an American citizen to renounce the false teachings of the Church of Rome. But even if the Pope himself should hurl at you all the excommunications and curses of the lower regions, don't be alarmed. You know the old saying, "curses, like chickens, come home to roost." Every nation and every individual that have been cursed or excommunicated by the popes and priests of Rome have been blessed by Almighty God. Keep on the straight way, dear brother, looking unto Jesus Christ, the author and finisher of our faith; and the spirit of God will guide you into all truth, and the love of Christ in your soul will strengthen you against all the attacks of your enemies.

FROM WILLIAM S. COURTNEY of Pennington Seminary, Pennington, N. J., we have received an interesting article on his conversion from the Roman Catholic faith, which will appear in our next issue. His conversion dates back only a few years, yet in that time he has gained his present honorable position as one of the staff of Pennington Seminary.

Conversion of a Scotch Roman Catholic Priest.

On Sunday, the 29th October, 1884, the Rev. Donald Mackay, M. A., who was a priest in the Romish Church from September, 1870, to April last, was ordained in St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Edinburgh, as a minister of the Episcopal Church. The morning service of the Church was read up to the third collect, after which Bishop Cotterill (the Bishop of Edinburgh) preached from John xx., 21, 22. Rev. Dr. Teape, minister of St. Andrew's congregation, then presented Father Mackay to the Bishop, and the questions of the ordination service were gone through. In the evening Mr. Mackay preached his first sermon after ordination, speaking from Matt. xxii., 37, 38, on the love of God. Mr. Mackay signed a deed of recantation, drawn up by the Bishop of Edinburgh, on the 4th July last, and has since been a curate in St. Andrew's Church. He is a native of the Highlands of Scotland.

Celibacy and Morality.

The Roman Catholic Hierarchy at their Council in Baltimore took occasion to condemn the exposures of convent life by Maria Monk, Edith O'Gorman and others, who had been inmates of convents for years, and who gave to the public their own experiences of such a life. The good things said in those books were commended

by all, but the vile things said about the loves of priests and nuns—well, they could not be true, for both the priests and nuns are so “meek-looking,” you know, they couldn't do such things. Couldn't they? Read the following despatches, which appeared in all the daily papers of the chief cities of the United States on the dates named, and then say it is impossible that such wickedness could exist among a “holy” body of men like the priests. How long will the people continue to rely for their souls' salvation on the “absolutions” and “masses” of such infamous wretches as are here depicted? May the Lord open their eyes to the one and only way of salvation by direct access to him through our Lord Jesus Christ!

Priestly Crimes.

LONDON, Dec. 6, 1884.—All Italy is alarmed at the numerous priestly scandals which have recently come to light. Nearly every day the details of some shocking occurrence are published in which a priest is concerned, and the popular mind has become fairly saturated with the idea that an epidemic of clerical crime prevails throughout the kingdom. At Marcellina, a small village in the north of Italy, near Rivoli and Turin, a sacristan named Progetti fatally stabbed a priest with a dagger for eloping with his wife, and on appeal refusing to surrender her.

At Pozzone, near Caserta, seventeen miles from Naples, the Mayor of the village stabbed a curé for seducing his sister.

At Marinella, near Civita Vecchia, a captain in the navy named Gelli, discovered that criminal relations existed between his wife and daughter, and the village priest. Gelli killed his wife with a stiletto, but did not molest her betrayer. He was tried for murder and was sentenced to five years' imprisonment.

In the Via Lungara, at Rome, a priest named Angelo Lardi, seventy years of age, has been arrested for stabbing a maiden who resisted his advances.

The above are the more prominent of the many crimes which have occurred, and the feeling of abhorrence and disgust has latterly become so pronounced, and threats of popular vengeance so loud, that even the walls of the Vatican were not proof against them. It is now authoritatively stated that a cardinal holding high office has finally, but with great difficulty, succeeded in bringing the whole matter of these scandals to the notice of the Pope, who showed intense concern and mortification at the details which were laid before him. He at once ordered a searching inquiry into the whole question of priestly purity, and asked that nothing be left undone that would tend to relieve the Church of the odium which had been cast upon her by her unworthy sons.

Italian liberals are gloating over these clerical misdemeanors and point to them as proving that the Church is rotten to the core.

Canadian Clerical Scandals.

MONTREAL, Dec. 13.—The clerical scandals, which are being brought to light in France and Italy, promise to be followed by even more compromising revelations regarding the immorality existing among the Catholic clergy of this Province. A short time ago the preacher at the Bishop's Cathedral was removed from the pulpit in a helpless state of intoxication, and a few days later, made a further exhibition of himself in the most fashionable street in the city. This young priest who is a son of one of the most respected judges in the country, has since been banished to a monastery in France. No sooner had the scandal in this case abated when the parish priest of Varennes, a pretty little village on the St. Lawrence a short dis-

tance from here, was brought into court by a prominent citizen of the place who charged his father-confessor with estranging the affections of his wife and with other sins considered by the Church as mortal. A criminal action was instituted, but political influence was brought to bear upon the magistrate and he refused to issue the warrant, and the unfortunate husband is therefore compelled to seek redress before the civil courts. A little later the Catholics of the Province were further scandalized by the arrest of Father Toupin, the parish priest of Antoine Abbey, who is charged with desecrating the confessional and with other offences unfit for publication. The trial is fixed for Tuesday next, and the most gigantic efforts are being made by the ultramontane party to have a special and friendly judge appointed to preside.

In addition to these cases several instances have recently occurred which are opening the eyes of the educated Catholics of the Province to the fact that the management of the asylums and other institutions conducted by the Sisters of Mercy is not just as it should be in this age of enlightenment. The startling fact that a sane woman can be confined in a lunatic asylum for three years to gratify the vengeance of an unfaithful husband, as proved by the recent trial of Mrs. Lyman, has also had the effect of rousing the public mind to the dangers attending institutions conducted by the nuns with no proper system of government or medical inspection. Further astounding revelations are promised concerning the management of this now famous Longue Pointe Asylum.

An attempt has been made to hush up all these scandals by the clerical party, but the Liberals who are twitted with being Freemasons and disciples of Renan, are jubilant, as they fancy they see the influence of the priests gradually decreasing, and their accession to power in this Province a possibility of the future.

Was the Apostle Peter ever in Rome?

BY REV. MASON GALLAGHER, OF THE
REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

PART III.

For more than a century after the death of St. Peter we have no mention of this Apostle in connection with the City of Rome, by any writer.

There are two writers in this period whose works have come down to us, each of whom makes one casual allusion to this Apostle: Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch. The examination of the language of the latter writer made in our last article, shows that it does not affect the question considered.

Ignatius, in one aspect, may be regarded rather as an antagonist to the claims of the Roman Communion. This point is forcibly presented in the *Christian Observer*, Nov. 1883, p. 742: "The words of Ignatius, as Archbishop Wake gives them, are these: '*I write unto the Churches*, and signify to them all, that I am willing to die for God unless you hinder me' 'I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. They were Apostles, I a condemned man. They were free, but I am even unto this day a servant.'"

The Apostles had written unto the Churches: so did Ignatius. But the Apostles, so writing, could *command* the Churches, while he, Ignatius, did not pretend to do so. Is not this one plain meaning of the words? But where is there one word implying that Peter had visited Rome?

On the other hand, see what is implied in the *silence* of Ignatius. The assumption of Father McCorry is that Peter had founded the Church of

Rome, was its bishop for five and twenty years, and was finally martyred there; and that he left his primacy, the popedom, to the bishops who should follow him in that chair.

Well, we now have an aged bishop, in the next century, writing seven letters to various churches just before his martyrdom. *In six of these epistles, he particularly notices their bishops.* But when he comes to the Church of Rome for the first time he is silent. The Romish hypothesis now is, that at Rome, there was the Chair of St. Peter; that the bishop of that city was St. Peter's successor, the Primate of the whole Church, and in that city they showed the burying place of the Apostles. How can it be accounted then, that Ignatius—fond to an excess of bishops, and just about to follow St. Peter in his martyrdom—should write to Rome, without once alluding to St. Peter's chair; and should even refer to St. Peter's epistles without remembering the fact (if it *were* a fact)—that the remains of the Apostle rested in that soil?

Truly, that remarkable *silence*, to use Father McCorry's own phrase, 'speaks volumes.' How *could* that aged bishop, who in no other case forgets to address and compliment the bishop and the Church to which he was writing—how comes he to forget to venerate the successor of St. Peter, the primate of the whole Church? Only in one way can this omission be accounted for. Ignatius knew nothing of any successor of St. Peter; in his days there was no Pope. To believe that there was a Pope at Rome in A.D. 147, and that St. Peter's tomb was known to be there, is exceedingly difficult, in the face of Ignatius's silence on both these topics.

CLEMENT OF ROME.

Clement of Rome, a contemporary of the Apostle, is appealed to both by Protestant and Roman writers in support of the tradition that Peter visited the Imperial City. If this writer makes this affirmation, it is enough to settle the question. "Clement," says Chevalier in his Introduction to his translation of the Epistle of this writer: "is believed upon the general testimony of ecclesiastical historians, to have been the same whom St. Paul mentions among his fellow-laborers, whose names are written in the book of life."—Philippians iv., 3.

"The epistle of Clement to the Church at Corinth is the only genuine work of any uninspired writer of the first century, now extant."—Riddle's Eccles. Chron., p. 13.

"By ecclesiastical writers generally nothing that is not divine is admitted to be of higher authority."—Coleman's Apos. and Prim. Ch., p. 164.

Clement, according to Bunsen's Chronology, Hypolytus, vol. i., p. 44, was bishop between the years 78 and 86.

Of this Epistle, Bishop Lightfoot writes: "We cannot hesitate to accept the universal testimony of antiquity that it was written by Clement, the reputed Bishop of Rome."—Of his office he remarks: "He was rather the chief of the presbyters, than the chief over the presbyters."—Christ. Ministry, p. 67.

The testimony of this earliest and most esteemed of uninspired writers is of great importance as settling the question that the order of bishops and presbyters was the same in both the Churches of Corinth and of Rome; and no argument whatever can be

based on it in support of the authority of the Episcopal office as a distinct order.

As to the hypothesis of Peter's visit to Rome, some Roman Catholic and Protestant writers have claimed Clement as a witness to the affirmative.

Baronius, Bellarmine and Pearson prudently refrain from appealing to his testimony.

Feuardent, Baratier, Lardner and McCorry refer to him as an authority for Peter's residence at Rome.

McCorry writes thus in his Treatise, p. 67: "The first witness that we shall bring forward is Clement the Roman, a disciple of Peter. After the persecution of Diocletian had subsided, he wrote an epistle to the Corinthians; in which he speaks of those who had suffered martyrdom at Rome, and makes distinct mention of St. Peter as the great bishop who had founded and governed the Roman Church. He says: 'Let us always have before our eyes those good Apostles: Peter, who endured so many labors, and who dying a martyr, departed to glory; and Paul, who obtained the reward by patience, and suffered martyrdom under the emperors. To these men who had led so angelic a life, a vast multitude of the elect were added, who rivalling one another in suffering reproaches and torments, have left behind them for our sake the most beautiful example.' Now here is a declaration from a contemporary writer bearing evidence to the fact that the prince of the Apostles died a martyr at Rome."

Dr. Lardner, in his history of the Apostles in the article on Peter, renders Clement's language thus—"Let us set before our eyes the excellent Apostles: Peter, who through unrighteous zeal

underwent not one or two, but many labors, till at last being martyred, he went to the place of glory that was due unto him. Through zeal, Paul obtained the reward of patience. Seven times he was in bonds; he was whipped, he was stoned. He preached both in the East and West, and having taught the world righteousness, and coming to the borders of the West, and suffering martyrdom under the governors, so he departed out of the world, and went to the most holy place, being a most eminent pattern of patience." Similar is the translation of this writer, by Wake, Chevalier, Greenwood and Simon, except the passage, "the borders of the West." Wake renders it, "the utmost bounds"; Chevalier, "the furthest extremity"; Simon, "the remotest limits"; Greenwood, "the extreme verge."

With respect to the false version of this passage of Clement, offered by Father McCorry, Simon, p. 309, remarks: "The translations of this writer are invaluable as showing to what lengths a few of the Roman Clergy now among us go, and are obliged to go upon this subject and these passages."

The argument of Lardner founded on these words of Clement, for the supposed Roman residence of Peter, is as follows: "From these passages I think it may be justly concluded that Peter and Paul were martyrs at Rome in the time of Nero's persecution. For they suffered among the Romans, where Clement was bishop and in whose name he was writing to the Corinthians. They were martyrs, when many others were an *example*, or *pattern*, of a like patience among them. To these Apostles, says Clement, was joined a great multi-

tude of choice ones, or elect, that is, Christians. This is a manifest description of Nero's persecution at Rome, when a multitude of Christians there were put to death, under grievous reproaches and exquisite torments, as we are assured by Tacitus. These were joined to the excellent Apostles, Peter and Paul, before mentioned. Therefore Peter and Paul had suffered at that place, and at that time; and as it seems, according to this account, at the beginning of that persecution, which may be reckoned not at all improbable."

When Clement says that Paul *suffered martyrdom under the governors*, he may be understood to mean *by order of the magistrate*. It cannot be here inferred that Peter and Paul did not die by Nero's order, or in virtue of his edict against the Christians. It should be considered that Clement is not an historian. He is writing an epistle containing divers exhortations. It is not needful for him to be more particular. He does not name the city in which Peter and Paul died, nor the death they underwent. But he intimates that they suffered a cruel death, together with many choice ones among them, which must mean Rome, and he plainly represents these Apostles as martyrs, who had suffered through envy and unrighteous zeal. The place and the manner of their death were well-known to the Christians at Corinth, to whom Clement was writing. Dr. Lardner goes on to say that Clement was obliged to be "circumspect" in his language in that period of "persecution." Lardner argues against Pearson, that Nero was in Rome in the year 68, and that therefore the term "governors" may refer to that Em-

peror. "As for the word being in the plural number: it is no uncommon thing to prefer that to the singular when we are obliged to be cautious, etc. . . . So that I must take the liberty to say, that Pearson's observation, that Peter and Paul were put to death, not by Nero, but by the Prefect of Rome, or some other great officer in the absence of the Emperor, appears to be of no value, and it is destitute of all authority."—See Watson's *Theological Tracts*, Vol. II., pp. 433-5.

Dr. Lardner has made as much of Clement's words for his argument as is possible.

We give on the other side the comments of three barristers who have thoroughly examined the question.

Ecclesiastical events demand as careful investigation as any subjects.

The supposed journey of Peter to Rome does not appear to be sustained by trustworthy testimony, according to the view of the eminent laymen whose opinions are herewith presented.

Greenwood, who has written the political history of the Latin Pontificate, in his *Cathedra Petri*, I., 20, writes on Clement's language:

"In proof of the facts here stated respecting Peter and Paul as parts of one transaction, it has been observed, that the sufferings and death of both being mentioned, as it were in the same breath, by one who was in a position to be an eye-witness of the things he relates, a presumption arises that both Apostles were together at Rome at some point of time between the closing incidents of St. Luke's narrative and the death of Paul in the Neronian persecution. Peter's martyrdom, however, is only remotely alluded to, and not in

any way as synchronous with that of Paul. Several things are said of Paul that are not said of Peter, more especially the act of preaching the Gospel in the far West. Lastly neither time nor place of the martyrdom of either is mentioned; consequently all ground for concluding from this passage in the writings of Clement of Rome that Peter and Paul dwelt and suffered together in that city—seems to fall to the ground."

Simon, another learned lawyer, who, for the purpose of investigating the question here discussed, came to London, and almost dwelt in the British Museum for nine months, in his *Mission and Martyrdom of Peter*, p. 34, writes with respect to Clement's statement: "The first question that here suggests itself is, why is Paul's journey into Europe and Paul's martyrdom at Rome, so pointedly stated in the very same paragraph in which nothing more is said of Peter's travels or of Peter's martyrdom than what manifestly presupposes the Scripture account about his going to the Jews of the Dispersion, as he was directed by his Divine Master, and about his being put to death at Babylon as his own epistles intimate? How is it that Clement makes no allusion to a residence in Europe, or even to a martyrdom there for the Apostle of the Circumcision as well as for the Apostle of the Gentiles? Peter's martyrdom took place in Clement's lifetime; how is it that Clement never heard of anything connected with it at variance with the facts that are laid before us in the Scriptures? But we do not inquire for the evidences of Peter's having lived and died as is indicated in the sacred text. Our inquiry is for the alleged evidence of

his not having done so. Father McCorry supposes St. Clement to speak of the martyrs that had fallen in his own city! whereas Clement speaks of those who had fallen within the memory of that present generation. 'Let us look at the illustrious examples of OUR OWN AGE, says the bishop of Rome; let us take, for instance, the Apostles!'"

Bouzique, a recent member of the French bar and legislature, in his History of Christianity, in his examination of Clement, remarks, vol. I., p. 360: "This passage, which clearly excludes the idea of a punishment simultaneously undergone at Rome by the two Apostles, seems nevertheless to have been one of the principal sources whence proceeded the legends on the abode of Peter in that city, and on the tragical end which the Apostle to the Gentiles found there at the same time. It is necessary to remember that in the first centuries Clement's epistle was in some sort received as a sacred scripture, and read publicly in the Churches of Greece, Asia Minor and all the Hellenic lands. This habitual reading singularly formed the opinions which legend had got possession of. Clement said nothing else but that Peter and Paul were persecuted through envy, which caused the death of one on the confines of the West and made the other seven times endure before God called him to himself.

"But in ceaselessly hearing in the epistle the death of the two Apostles mentioned close together, the Greek Churches came to believe that they perished at the same time, and as the letter came from Rome, at Rome the hearers placed their simultaneous punishment in thought.

"It was supposed that Clement had been the disciple of the one as of the other and the ocular witness of their

death. . . . If you call to mind the evils endured as much by Peter as by Paul, you see that it is the intention of offering in them illustrious examples of the evil that envy may engender, and not to make them perish in the same time and in the same place.

"But the Christian populace made a mistake. Clement associated the two in the example, the popular legend associated them in suffering and death. It is only two or three generations after the first epistle of Clement that we begin to find some traces of the legend on the journey and the death of Peter at Rome: all this time was needful for it to gain a certain consistency.

"The whole drift of Clement's testimony then, while it breathes not one word of support of St. Peter's visit to Rome, does imply, by the distinction drawn between him and St. Paul, that *he did not* preach both in the East and in the West—*i.e.*, that he did not visit Rome."

Bacon in his "Lives of the Apostles," thus refers to Lardner's criticism. Alluding to manuscript lectures of Professor Murdock on this subject, he writes: "Lardner also gives a sort of abstract of the passage in the Fathers, which refers to this subject, but not near so full, nor so close to the original passages as that of Dr. Murdock, although he refers to a few authors not alluded to here, whose testimony, however, amounts to little or nothing. Lardner's disposition to believe all these fully established Roman fables, is too pronounced, and on these points his accuracy appears to fail in maintaining its general character.

"However, in the single passage from Clemens Romanus referred to above, he is very full, not only translating the whole passage relating to Peter and Paul, but entering into a very elaborate discussion of the views taken of it; but upon all he fails so utterly in rearing an historical argument on this slender basis, that I cannot feel called on, in this place, to do anything more than barely refer the critical reader to the passage in this Life of Peter."

Father Chiniquy's Persecutors.

SERMON DELIVERED IN TAYLOR PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MONTREAL, NOV. 16, 1884, BY REV. JOHN J. CASEY, B.D., PASTOR OF THE CHURCH.

"They that set the city in an uproar are come hither also." Acts xvii., 6. (Douay Version of the Scriptures.)

I have chosen these words this evening because there is a very close resemblance between this event in the life of the Apostle Paul and the disturbances which have during the past week disgraced the city of Montreal. I notice a resemblance in the cause of the disturbance in both cases; also in the means adopted by the Jews in the days of Paul and by the French Canadians now to create an uproar, as well as in the readiness of both parties to cast the blame from themselves upon those who were the victims rather than the originators of the trouble. Let us look at the passage before us and see what is told us there. The Apostle Paul, we read, came on a missionary tour to Thessalonica. During three weeks he preached day after day to his countrymen who were living there. He took their own Scriptures and from them showed that their views about religion were altogether wrong. He proved to them that faith in Jesus Christ was the only means of salvation—that he alone could forgive sin and grant eternal life. The result was that many were convinced and turned to Christ. But there were Jews who would not believe. What did they do? Did they seek to overthrow Paul's arguments by direct appeals to the Word of God? No. They went about the city—excited the passions and prejudices of the ignorant and bigoted,

gathered together a mob of the lowest kind, created an uproar, and then tried to throw the whole blame upon the apostles of Jesus Christ by complaining to the rulers. "They that set the city in an uproar are come hither also." From these words I wish to show that the object of the disturbance was:

A base attempt on the part of unprincipled men to silence the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

There is nothing more fatal to error than truth—nothing that the teachers of false doctrines fear more than the teaching of truth. We need not therefore wonder that the Jewish teachers of Thessalonica feared the influence of the preaching of Paul on his countrymen. They resorted to every means in their power to destroy that influence. They sought to blacken his character, and to show that he was a man whose chief aim in life was to cause disturbance. Notice the charge which those Jews made against him and his companions. "They that set the city in an uproar are come hither also." Again in the charge made by Tertullus against him when Paul was a prisoner in Cesarea: "We have found this fellow," said he, "a pestilent fellow and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes." Such were the means which bad men adopted nineteen centuries ago when they sought to destroy the influence of an apostle of Jesus Christ. And have not the same contemptible means been adopted by every false system of religion from Paul's day to our own? Read what has been printed in the Roman Catholic papers of this city during the past few days. Hear what

bigots, from the chief magistrates of the city down, have been saying about a man who for twenty-five years was an eminent priest of their Church. What do they say about the old man Chiniquy? Just what the Jews in former times said about Paul the Apostle. "We have found this fellow Chiniquy a pestilent fellow—a disturber of the city's peace. Away with him. He is unworthy to live." Such were the bitter things that were said during the past few days about one, who, whatever faults he may possess, has proved himself during many years a faithful missionary of the Canadian Presbyterian Church. We may see therefore how little reliance can be placed upon such charges when they are made by men whose sole object is to defame the character and destroy the influence of any man whom they fear. If the Jews of Thessalonica believed that what Paul taught was untrue—why did they not seek in the only proper way to prove its untruthfulness? Paul came among them preaching, "that Jesus whom they had crucified was the Son of God—the Saviour of the world. He taught that man was saved alone by the merits and the death of Christ—that the blood of Jesus, not human works, could atone for sin—that there was only one Mediator between God and man—the Man Christ Jesus." He appealed to their own Scriptures for proof of what he taught. Why did not they too appeal to the teachings of Moses and the prophets and prove from them that Paul was wrong? For the simple reason that their own Scriptures condemned them. Their only argument was, to create an uproar in the city, and blame Paul as the cause of the disturbance.

How great the resemblance between the tactics of the Jews in the days of the apostle and the tricks of the priests of Rome in our days. Here comes one to our city, to preach to his countrymen, in a bold and manly fashion, the Gospel of Christ. With her own Scriptures open before him he opposes the teachings of the Church of Rome. How do the priests seek to silence this new apostle of error? With arguments drawn from the Word of God? No. They excite their bigoted followers to silence with persecution the voice of the aged missionary of the Gospel. What are those priests of Rome afraid of? Do they not profess to believe that their Scriptures are God's revelation to man? Do they not quote them, when they can, in support of the doctrines of their Church? Are they afraid that their own Scriptures will condemn them? Yes. They fear that their people will learn that the men in whom they trusted have smuggled false doctrines into the Church of Christ. Let any priest, who dares to do so, take Paul's Epistle to the Church at Rome, and prove to us that they now teach the same doctrines which the ministers of that Church taught in the days of the Apostles. Where will they find in that epistle proof for the doctrines of the mass, auricular confession, the intercession of Mary and the saints, purgatory, or any of those other doctrines which are the peculiar property of the Church of Rome? If any priest in Montreal or elsewhere could point to anything in that Epistle authorizing these things, I would turn again and once more become a member of the Roman Catholic Church. I know well, and the priests know, that they could find no

such authority. I am ashamed to think that I ever belonged to that Church, when I find that not a single priest has opened his mouth to deprecate the evil attempts that had been made on the life of this noble old man, whose mission was to rescue the perishing. Let them search the Scriptures from beginning to end, they will find no proof in them for those beliefs against which the true Church of Christ in all ages has protested. Hence the opposition of Rome to the free preaching of the Gospel. It is not Chiniquy that Rome seeks to silence—it is the truth of Christ. It is the freedom to preach what we believe to be the truth, in our own churches, that is endangered. No minister of the Gospel can afford to be silent at such a time; in defending the freedom of speech for one man we are maintaining the rights of all. And now I will proceed to show that both in the case of the Apostle Paul and in Father Chiniquy's, the uproar caused by the priestly mob was a base attempt to put down a man whose influence they feared.

I have often been asked by so-called liberal Protestants, why do not men who leave the Church of Rome to become Protestants settle down quietly in their new faith without preaching against the faith which they abandoned? Many indeed do so; and in one sense it would be better were all who leave the Church of Rome to follow their example. Personally I have had to bewail the tearing asunder of earthly ties. I have seen my family and the friends of my youth turn from me with loathing. I have received letters from my brothers and sisters in which they told me that they "prayed

God day and night, that he would strike me dead in my pulpit." Such was the effect of the teaching of the unscriptural Church of Rome. That Church would not feel so bitterly against us, and our lives here would be far more comfortable, if we did not preach the Gospel. But let me ask those liberal men and women, which is the better religion for all men, Protestant or Catholic? Will they not say, Protestantism, of course? Let me ask them again, do they believe that the world would have been as far advanced to-day if the religion of Rome had continued to exercise her former power over the minds of men? Will they not say unhesitatingly, No? Where then is the force of their objection against Father Chiniquy and the other ex-priests who are now preaching the Gospel of Christ? Would Scotland have been better had John Knox left Scotch Romanism alone? Yet Knox was a priest. Why did John Calvin preach the Gospel in Geneva? Calvin too was a priest. Why did Luther attack Romanism in Germany? Was not he too a priest? In a word, as you go back through the centuries, the same question might be asked a hundred times. Why did not Wycliff and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and Savonarola, and Claude of Turin, and Vigilantius and others like them, when they ceased to believe the doctrine of Rome, keep silent? Yet all of these men were priests, and all of them opposed Rome. Shall I tell you why they did not keep silent? Because they felt as Paul felt when he said: "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." You might as well ask Fred Douglas, why he spoke against slavery? or John B. Gough, why he speaks

against rum? It is because both of those men felt the degrading effects of these terrible evils whose power they sought to overthrow.

And now, before we conclude, let us see some of the charges made by the priests of Rome against Father Chiniquy. Why are they so bitter against this aged man?

First. "Because," they say, "he was a priest and became a Protestant minister." To which we answer. Had he not the right to do so, if he wished? Do they find fault when Protestant ministers leave their Churches and become Romish priests? Have they not conferred the highest honors on Manning and Newman, perverts from the Church of England? Do we deny the right of those men to leave a Church in whose teachings they ceased to believe? No. We may wonder at the blindness of such men. But we respect the liberty of conscience, and the right of private judgment in matters of religion. We leave such men to answer to God for the change which they made. But, again, the priests say:

Secondly. "Chiniquy not only left his Church, but preaches against his former religion." We ask again, Has he not the right to do so, if he wills? Have not even infidels the liberty Sunday after Sunday to preach in this city against the religion of Christ? Did not Paul, in former times preach against the Jewish religion in which he was reared? And who will say that this man, a British subject, in a British city, dare not preach to his countrymen what he believes to be the true religion of Christ? Is he to have less freedom under the British flag than Paul had under the heathen standard of the Roman Empire? No. The priests must learn that they whom Christ hath made free can never consent to be in subjection to the power of Rome. They must respect our rights, as we are willing that theirs should be maintained.

And now a word in conclusion to those who are at the head of this opposition to Father Chiniquy and others. They are French Canadians. Let me remind them of two events in the history of their mother-country France. I would ask them to compare the reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XVI., to see how terribly the teachings of their Church in one age may tend to destroy that Church in another. In the reign of Louis XIV., the priests had full sway over the minds of men. How did they use that power? They used it to destroy all who would not submit to their teaching. But what was the result in after years? Does not history teach that the horrid principles instilled during centuries in the French mind then bore fruit? The descendants of those bigots, who in former times had hanged, and burned, and butchered in every conceivable way the Protestants of France, put in practice against their teachers the lessons which they had learned. The cry was no longer, "down with the Protestants," but "down with the priests." Then Catholic churches were destroyed. Monks and nuns were driven from their cloisters, priests and bishops were hunted down, like wild beasts, and murdered. The teachings of the Jesuits had prepared the way for the teachings of Diderot and his infidel companions, and the "Reign of Terror" in France was the result. Let the priests and magistrates of Montreal take warning from the history of their Church in France. Let them beware lest a time may come when the descendants of those, who are now shouting—"Down with Chiniquy," may learn to cry, "Down with the priests! Down with the men who have befooled us so long, who taught us to persecute our best friends! Down with the Church that taught us to destroy." That such a time may not come, let both Protestants and Catholics now unite in putting down that lawlessness which would hinder the freedom of speech, and the right of men to worship God as they deem best. Amen.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY.

Second Series.

LETTER I.

NEW YORK, Dec. 18, 1884.

Sir :

For nearly a year I have allowed you some repose from what you considered the annoyance of my letters to you. During that time I have not been idle, as my work in preaching in this city, the successful launching of the little bark (*THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC MAGAZINE*), that in time will run down the "bark of Peter," as you call your Church, and the publication of my previous letters to you in collected form, can testify.

I have more work on my hands now than ever, but I gladly resume my correspondence with you, and will not consider it extra labor if I can be the means of enlightening Protestants and Catholics on the almost limitless phases of the teaching and practices of your Church. From many quarters I have received encouragement to write on those subjects that affect your followers in this personal manner, not the least of which has been the conversion of many Roman Catholics through my first series of letters. My previous training as a priest of your Church gives me a certain right to speak boldly to you on behalf of the people whom your Church has deceived, yet I trust I shall observe the courtesies of life in all my plain speaking. It may be well to say once for all, however, that while I observe the proprieties of life towards you personally, I have no respect whatever for the doctrines of your Church that separate it from the true Catholic Church, the Church of Christ, to which all faithful Christians belong. Those doctrines I shall combat with all the energy I can command, while at the same time I shall endeavor to make plain the way of salvation through and by the Lord Jesus Christ alone.

The greatest event in the history of your Church in this country, Cardinal, has been the Plenary Council which has just closed its meeting in Baltimore. Some regret has been expressed that you did not attend the Council, and the excuse has been put forth that your health would not permit you to be present. But every one who is conversant with the inner workings of the Roman Catholic Church knows that this was not the cause of your absence. The truth is, the Pope appointed Archbishop Gibbons of Baltimore his delegate to preside over the Council, and as your rank as Cardinal places you next to the Pope himself, your dignity and self-love would not permit you to take even second place in this assembly of bishops. I commend you for your good sense in this matter, though I am sorry you had not the manliness to resent the Pope's snubbing. But all true manhood is destroyed in your priests and bishops by the Pope's despotic power over them.

The decrees and enactments of this Council cannot be known until the mighty man, the Pope, has revised them. But the utterances of some of the bishops

in what were called the public sessions give an indication of the subjects that were considered. The speakers at these public lectures were put forward to voice the sentiments of your Church on many of the vital questions of the day. The growth of your Church in the United States, its relation to our Republican form of Government, its attitude towards Protestantism, its opposition to our public school system, the education of the Romish clergy, the best means for extending your influence among careless Protestants, and kindred topics were discussed by your ablest bishops.

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester spoke on the growth of your Church in this country, a subject to which I referred in the last number of the *CONVERTED CATHOLIC*. But he said some things that are worth remembering. His lecture was printed in many Roman Catholic papers, and from it I cull these pregnant sentences:

"From the beginning of the century until 1834, Catholics moved among their fellow-citizens quietly and with exceeding humility and meekness. They were specially careful not to offend their separated brethren and received in return becoming pity and tolerance. No one feared them; they were so few in number, so inconsequential and so anxious not to offend. The condition of tolerance was accepted as a boon rather than demand the right of equality before the law to which they were born.

"About this time, however, the steady influx of immigrants from all countries of Europe, but chiefly of Catholics from Ireland, the building of large and costly churches in important cities, the opening of colleges and convents, the multiplying of bishops and priests, turned pity into fear."

This fear of the growing influence of your Church naturally begot opposition from Protestants, who knew how dangerous to liberty it always was and always will be. That such opposition was well directed Bishop McQuaid freely acknowledges:

"The efforts against us that lasted from 1830 to 1860 proved a formidable hindrance to the advance of the Church. The timid, the ambitious, the vain, feared to belong to a body of so little esteem in the world's eye, and fell away. Money was lavishly spent in perverting the minds of the young. The spenders of it thought that they were doing God's work. Because the enemies of the Church are not working on the same lines to day, it is not to be inferred that the battle is over, and that all danger has passed."

"Even when parents did not become Protestants, their children succumbed to the influence of their surroundings, and learned to despise and deny the belief and practices of their parents' religion, through the adverse pressure of companionship, and daily intercourse with the opponents of Catholic doctrines. Social seductions and fashions overmaster the young and lead them captive. When mixed marriages in such conditions of society intervened to increase the danger, the children had no hope and were invariably lost. Without Catholic lessons at home, with neither Church nor priest to teach and support them, they fell an easy prey to the vigilant and zealous labors of the enemies of the Catholic Church."

To counteract the civilizing influences of the institutions of the country, the Romish parochial schools were established. Referring to them Dr. McQuaid says:

"Without these schools, in a few generations our magnificent cathedrals and churches would remain as samples of monumental folly—of the unwisdom of a capitalist who consumes his fortune year by year without putting it out at interest or allowing it to increase. The Roman Church has lost more in the past from the want of Catholic schools than from any other cause. The 2,500 schools, with a half million of scholars, which now bless our country, tell Catholics and Protestants that the question of religious education is settled so far as we are concerned. The good work so well advanced will not halt until all over the land the children of the Church are sheltered under her protecting care. The establishment of these schools and their improvement in management and instruction is our surest guarantee of future growth and fixedness."

Of course the public schools are condemned in the most violent and malignant language at this bishop's command. The efforts to obtain State aid for those schools, he says, will be continued until this "reasonable request" of Roman Catholics is granted. That is their hope, and if the present apathy of the American people continues, those efforts will surely be crowned with success.

That the Roman Church is stronger to-day in America than in any country of Europe is loudly proclaimed :

"The figures summing up the number of cathedrals, churches, colleges, convents, etc., do not convey an idea of the character of these edifices. There are among them edifices which Europe of modern days cannot equal in size, grandeur and completeness. What has Europe to place by the side of the New York Cathedral as her contribution to church building in the nineteenth century. Look at the seminary buildings at Overbrook, Baltimore, Boston; at our collegiate buildings in the East and in the West; at convents and monasteries innumerable. These are not surpassed by any country in the world."

The "figures" to which Bishop McQuaid refers regarding the schools show that there are 2,352 Roman Catholic parochial schools in the United States, and that the number of children in them is 481,834. This number is nearly seven per cent. of the Roman Catholic population of the country, while the public schools have not more than ten per cent. of the whole population of the country. "This increase of Roman Catholic schools," a contemporary says, "bodes no good to the future of the United States. The Roman Catholic Church has been the persistent foe of human progress in just those matters on which the stability and success of free institutions depend. Education in the largest and best sense, the training of the people to individual thinking, to self-reliance, to mental and moral responsibility—this is the necessary condition of sound and progressive republican Government. The Roman Catholic Church is based in all its complex organization on the idea of absolute monarchy; and that idea pervades it through and through. Authority, in it, comes not up from the mental and moral convictions of its members, but comes down from the mind of one man, its head, whose word is recognized as supreme. The evil and peril of such a system for our country and time lie in the fact that the *absolute* principle on which that Church is founded and under which its membership is trained is directly and totally antagonistic to the principles of democracy. The friends of Christian education must take note of this

vast power which is working steadily and cunningly to overthrow our public school system."

Speaking of the decision of the Council that "the States are to be asked to make appropriations to the Roman Catholic schools in proportion to the school tax paid by the Catholic population," the Rev. Dr. Irenæus Prime says in the *New York Observer*, "A demand of this sort will bring the Church directly into conflict with the American people. Of course if the Roman Catholics draw out from the common treasury what they claim to have paid in, all the other churches must be allowed to do the same, and the school system is annihilated at a blow. The foot of the priest is on the neck of every legislator in the communion of the Romish Church. And it is because that Church is a political institution, meddling with politics always, through its priests dictating to its people, that we have any reason to fear that this demand for the overthrow of the American school system may be insisted upon with fatal success."

Should any doubt remain in the minds of even the most tolerant Potestants that the Roman Catholics are aiming at political power, and are gaining it, let them enter the Mayors' offices in New York and Boston, after the first of January, 1885, and they will behold two Irish Roman Catholics serenely presiding over the municipal affairs of those cities. Mr. Grace has been Mayor of New York before, but since Boston was founded, no man born out of New England has been its Mayor until Mr. Patrick O'Brien was elected this month; and he was elected because he was an Irishman and a Roman Catholic.

Passing from Dr. McQuaid's school question to the lecture of Bishop Ireland, we find the latter uttering one of the most brazen falsehoods of the century. It is well-known to all Catholic priests that this Bishop Ireland gained his present position by bluster and bullying, in addition to his utter contempt for truth. Last year, when I was lecturing in St. Paul, Minnesota, where this bishop resides, he attacked me in the most violent manner. Thanks to the press of that city, I was given an opportunity of branding him as a calumniator, and the whole population rejoiced, for he is detested even by his own flock on account of his brawling propensities. He is a strong advocate of temperance, but I was told in St. Paul that he takes his wine as regularly and as copiously as you do yourself, Cardinal. When I was a Roman Catholic priest in Chicago, it was known to all the clergy there that Bishop Ireland had good reason for "swearing off" against "fire-water whiskey," but that good, generous wine would not affect his head.

This brawling bishop said in Baltimore that "the surest safeguards for her own life and prosperity the Republic will find in the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, and the more America acknowledges those teachings the more durable will her civil institutions be made Protestantism did nothing for liberty. It introduced into the world no new principle that favored liberty. Its claim to private judgment in religion was religious anarchy; if it was anything in civil and political life it was political anarchy."

Lest I should lose my temper in commenting on that barefaced statement, Cardinal, after keeping it in subjection while reading through his lecture, which is a tissue of falsehoods, I will let the editor of the *Boston Christian Register*

apply the lash to this mendacious bishop, which he does in the following vigorous manner :

"Bishop Ireland's extravagance is not of the half way order. He set out to make an astounding statement, and he succeeded. The statement was made at the Roman Catholic Plenary Council in Baltimore, and was this : 'Protestantism did nothing for liberty. It introduced into the world no new principle that favored liberty.' As a pure piece of brazen denial, this remark may rank with the famous denial of Peter, the so-called Bishop of Rome, who denied on one occasion that he had any connection or relationship with Jesus whatever, when the fact was that he owed to him all the importance which he possessed at that time. Peter repented of his denial, and it is to be hoped that Bishop Ireland will repent of his. Saul, in his fiery zeal, found it very hard 'to kick against the pricks,' and Bishop Ireland will find it hard to butt his mitred head against the facts of history. Romanism is a political and religious despotism. It claimed, and still claims, authority over the individual and the State. Martin Luther and the Protestant reformers aimed a mighty blow at this despotism. The principle of Protestantism was opposed to both of these assumptions, and the history of Protestantism shows that the development of civil freedom was the logical and historical outcome of its principles. In spite of Bishop Ireland's astounding assertion, a few millions of people who are able to read will continue to believe that, when the Pilgrims landed on the shores of New England, Protestantism did a mighty thing for civil and religious liberty."

I will not pursue this subject further. It is most disagreeable to me to expose the moral weakness of those whom I regarded with respect during my youth and early manhood. As a young man I naturally looked up to those who had the fashioning of my mind, and under whose care I was ordained to the priesthood. I believed in them with all my soul, and would as soon question my own existence as doubt their wisdom and veracity. I listened only to their voices, suppressing the longing for truth and knowledge that lay in my soul, avoiding the occasions of forming correct opinions, lest I should be led away from the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. A bishop was to me the oracle of God, and in those days I accepted what came from his lips as sacred truth. Alas and alas ! before I had been many years a priest, I discovered what frail, mortal clay those bishops were made of. The very man who ordained me gave me and his other priests an example that was far from edifying. I have abundant testimony relating to other bishops of your Church that shows their false statements to be the least among their deviations from the standard marked out by the Apostle Paul for a bishop of the Church of Christ :

"This is a true saying, if a man desire the office of bishop, he desireth a good work.

"A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous.

"One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?" (1. Tim. iii., 1-5.)

Such a reminder of the duty of a bishop must make you, Cardinal, and your brother-bishops see what usurpers you are of the office of overseers of the Church of Christ. You are blinded to the truth by the pomp and circumstances of your position, and the people, the poor souls for whom Christ died, and for whose moral training He established His Church, have been made spiritually blind by you, so that they believe as truth whatever you teach them. I have shown in this letter what designing and apt teachers of error some of your bishops are, and there I will leave you and them for the present.

You will hear from me in one or more letters in this form every month, and I sincerely hope you will be as much interested in them as you were in the first series. I know you perused my previous letters with a good deal of interest. I asked my informant, one of your priests who comes to see me occasionally, why you did not reply to them. His answer was that since the publication of the correspondence between Archbishop Hughes and Rev. Dr. Nicholas Murray, in the famous "Kirwan" letters, it was evident that the Roman Catholic cause would only suffer in such a correspondence. Besides, he added, it was peculiarly irksome for any Roman ecclesiastic to enter the lists of controversy with one who had left "the Church." This was apparent in the contest between Archbishop Hughes and Dr. Murray. The feeling would be intensified in the case of one who not only left "the Church," but had also thrown aside his priestly robes to take the Bible as the rule of faith and practice. It is bad enough when a layman like Dr. Murray abandons the Roman Catholic faith, and gives his reasons for so doing, but it is a great deal worse when a priest rejects the faith that he was ordained to teach, and endeavors to lead the people into the Christian way of salvation. This was doubtless the principal reason why the Cardinal did not answer my letters. This priest expressed the sentiments of all his brethren who still outwardly adhere to the Roman Catholic faith. They would not enter into controversy with one who had been a priest like themselves, for such a one has the advantage of his experience in and out of the Roman Church. He knows too much, and would not be restrained from telling what he knows by respect for the "holy Church" or its great dignitaries. You may change your mind in this matter, however, when you read this, Cardinal, and should you do so, I shall gladly publish your reply in the most conspicuous pages of the CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

Wishing you a merry Christmas in all Christian charity, and praying earnestly to God for your conversion during the year 1885, I commend you to the prayers of all Christians. The Church of Christ does not now need a sign or miracle to make manifest the great love wherewith He loves us, but if the grace of conversion should touch your heart the coming year, it would be a special mark of the divine favor to those who are fervently praying for your deliverance from Rome's yoke of bondage.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

ROME : PAGAN AND PAPAL.

Continued from Page 30.

Now, the adoption of these four vases—and no doubt other examples might be found—while it shows that the Christianity of Rome has no special horror of Paganism, at least so far as the worship of Bacchus is concerned, illustrates also the statement made above, that Roman Catholics on the Continent by no means shrink from that general adaptation of Heathenism which their English brethren so indignantly repudiate.

For see how freely the Italian priests use for the baptismal water of the Church those vessels from which once copious libations were wont to be poured out in honor of the Ogygian deity, amid the howlings of his drunken worshippers.

“Would you, then, never adapt anything Heathen to Christian use?”

I would not say so much, but would certainly avoid Heathen sculptures and emblems.

It is with pleasure that I recall what I have seen in some Pagan temples in Nubia—and, unless I am mistaken, also at Philæ in Egypt—where the idolatrous paintings on the walls had been daubed with Nile mud—obliterated, but not destroyed—by Christian worshippers, in order that their attention to their own service might not be distracted by Heathen blazonry.

With those long ago deceased Christians I have great sympathy ; for painted windows are to me what, I suppose, painted walls were to them : they sometimes fascinate my imagination to the injury of devotion, and more frequently offend my taste.

CHAPTER III.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

PART I.

THE corruption which Rome inherits began in the earliest days of the Church. As our Lord teaches, tares were from the first sown with the wheat. The prevalent idea of the purity of the early Church is a fiction : the Apostolic Church itself was not pure. And if that was not pure to which the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit belonged, what purity can be subsequently looked for? See how the corruption was spreading even during the lifetime of the apostles. The Church of Galatia had turned away from the Gospel to the Law ; the Colossians were scarcely in a better condition ; the Corinthians were walking disorderly ; the Hebrews were in a critical state. At Miletus the elders of the Ephesian Church were warned by Paul of “ravenous wolves,” and told that ruin was imminent to their communion. Peter, James, and Jude give sad note,

in their several epistles, of gross scandals which were then prevalent. And, last of all, the Lord's messages to the Seven Churches of Asia reveal deplorable corruption in their general condition.

This brings us down to about A.D. 96.

But if it went ill with the Church so far, things were much worse afterwards. By the rod of persecution the Christians were in some degree kept in the right path : but in the times of Constantine, when public persecution had ceased, worldliness and superstition openly took the lead. The effusion of the Spirit was small, and the standard of piety became proportionally low. Then priestly power and monkery asserted their sway, and Mariolatry began to come into prominence. And, while glorying in the faith of their martyred predecessors, the early Christians soon passed from venerating their memories to worshipping their bones. Then, as Jortin remarks :—"Itinerant monks, as pedlars, hawked their relics about the country, and their graves became the haunts of superstition. The Fathers of those times—Athanasius, Gregory Nazienzen, and others, but particularly Chrysostom with his popular eloquence—contributed to the utmost of their power to encourage the superstitious invocation of saints, the love of monkery, and the belief in miracles wrought by monks and relics. Some of these Fathers were valuable men ; but this was the disease of their age, and they were not free from it. In the fourth century they usually introduced an irregular worship of saints on the following plea :—"Why should not we Christians show the same regard to our saints as the Pagans do to their heroes ?" The transition from lawful to unlawful veneration was easily made. As the Pagans from honouring their heroes went on to deify them, so it was easy to see that, unless restrained, the Christians would conduct themselves in much the same manner towards their saints. And the Fathers gave the evil encouragement by their many indiscretions. Praying at the tombs of the martyrs was one of those fooleries which the Fathers should have restrained. What an idea did it give of the Almighty to weak Christians ! As if He would show more favour to their petition because it was offered at a place where a good man lay buried!"—*Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. iii., 7-17.

The same writer—he was Prebendary of St. Paul's and Archdeacon of London in the middle of the last century—in speaking of Justin Martyr, observes :—"Without detracting from the merits of this worthy man, truth and plain matter of fact extort from us that he and the rest of the Fathers are often poor and insufficient guides in things of judgment and criticism, and in the interpretation of the Scriptures ; sometimes in points of morality also, and of doctrine."—Vol. ii., 163.

So early, and so extensively, did Paganism begin to leaven the Church ; and convenience, and also the course of events, forwarded the evil. For the Heathen temples and the Heathen courts of justice—the latter stately and convenient buildings termed *basilicas*, that is, royal structures—were naturally utilized as places of Christian worship. In the case of the second class of edifice the metamorphosis was especially easy. The *apse*, which the Heathen magistrate and his assessors were wont to occupy—he being seated on a lofty

chair, and they on semicircular ascending grades of solid masonry—was now used by the bishop and his presbyters. There were rails—*cancelli*, whence the words *chancel* and *chancellor*—which separated the *apse* from the rest of the building. Close to these stood the Heathen *altar*, which gave place to the Christian communion-table. At the gates of the basilica—certainly at those of the temple—might have been the vessel for the *lustral water*, or water of purification, which remained as it was before, except that it was now called *holy water*. The images of the gods, if they were not removed, received new names, and, by a process of anointing and sprinkling, were turned into Christian saints. Sometimes, however, they were removed, and their places supplied by others less unsuitable. The hangings, draperies, and many of the ornaments remained; the body of the building with its two galleries was left unaltered. These basilicas formed the pattern for our noblest churches, one of which, yet in existence at Bethlehem, is supposed to be the oldest Christian structure standing. The grandest in Europe is St. Paul's, outside Rome—one of those many wonderful buildings erected to captivate the imagination of man and powerfully assist in bringing him under the sway of superstition.

Enthroned in an edifice thus royal and splendid, the bishop became a person of the greatest importance, and his office was much coveted. Not infrequently his election was attended with bloodshed. As Gibbon (chap. xx.) says:—"The interested views, the selfish and angry passions, the arts of perfidy and dissimulation, the secret corruption, the open and even bloody violence, which had formerly disgraced the freedom of election in the commonwealths of Greece and Rome, too often influenced the choice of the successors of the apostles." The historian is speaking of the era of Constantine, who died A.D. 337. The See of Rome, as being that of the capital, was of course the most coveted, and its bishops, who soon assumed a Heathen imperial title, that of Pontifex or Pontiff, naturally rose to the first distinction.

And so Paganism began to recover its power, and to prevail among the Christians themselves. "The gay and splendid appearance of the churches helped to allure the half-converts. New amusements made up for those which they had quitted. If they had been superstitious before, they might be so still. In the room of gods and goddesses they had saints male and female—lord and lady protectors—to whom they might pay their respects. Instead of sleeping in their former temples, they could slumber over the bones of the martyrs, and receive as good information and assistance as before. If they longed for miracles, prodigies, visions, omens, divinations, amulets and charms, they might be supplied."—*Jortin*, Vol. iii., 10.

In regard to the sleeping in the churches, we may remark that this is still practised at Jerusalem, in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, a night or more before "the holy fire." On one occasion I was much surprised to see a quantity of bedding in the church, and a number of both sexes waiting to occupy it. The sight was curious, but painful, and I was told that strange vows are made in connection with this ancient Heathen custom.

Du Choul (p. 319) says that in Pagan times the skins of victims which were part of the temple furniture formed the bedding. But he adds that, when Christianized, the custom became so abused that Constantine did away with such nocturnal devotions, *pour les insolences que l'on y faisoit*.

Something similar was, however, formerly carried on in St. Peter's at Rome, and continued even into the present century. At Easter a large cross was illuminated in the church, while the rest of the building was left in darkness. But all kinds of abominations compelled the discontinuance of the practice. Human nature, bad enough in the light, is still less to be trusted in darkness. However, when at Rome in 1852, I was told of something in St. Peter's even worse than this.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

PART II.

IN the preceding chapter, allusion was made to the irregularities and violence which frequently disgraced the election of a bishop in the early times of the Church. "In the latter half of the fourth century," writes Dean Milman, "the streets of Rome ran with blood during the contest of Damasus and Ursicinus for the bishopric of that city."

"One cannot say of Damasus, the successful combatant," remarks Archdeacon Jortin, "that he fought a good fight when he fought for his bishopric. His bravos, hired gladiators, and others, slew many of the opposite party; and great was the fury of the religious ruffians on both sides in this holy war. Pious times, and much to be honored and envied!"

The historian Ammianus Marcellinus—an honest Pagan, as Gibbon calls him—relates that Juventius, the governor of Rome, was quite unable to put an end to these disorders, and was at last compelled by the violence of the Church factions to withdraw from the city. "Ultimately," continues the historian, "Damasus got the best of the strife by the strenuous efforts of his partisans. It is certain that on one day one hundred and thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the Basilica of Sicinius, which is a Christian Church." He adds that he does not marvel at the efforts which men put forth to obtain such a rank and power; "since, after they have succeeded, they will be secure for the future, being enriched by offerings from matrons—Damasus was called the 'ear-tickle of the ladies'—riding in carriages, dressing splendidly, and feasting luxuriously, so that their entertainments surpass even royal banquets." Strange contrast to the humble poverty of the apostles of Christ!

It was in A.D. 366 that Damasus fought for the Poppedom, in the sixtieth year of his age. "But," says Jortin, "the strangest part of the story is that Damasus was a *saint*, and that miracles were wrought in his favour after his death!" The world will love its own, and here is an example of those whom it deifies! What matter, whether they be Heathen heroes or Christian Saints?

Pope Damasus died towards the close of the fourth century, and here is a bird's-eye view from Gibbon of what followed in the Church.

"If, in the beginning of the fifth century, Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead, to assist at the festival of some popular saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation on the profane spectacle which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation. As soon as the doors of the church were thrown open, they must have been offended with the smoke of incense, the perfume of flowers, and the glare of lamps and tapers, which diffused, at noon-day, a gaudy, superfluous, and, in their opinion, a sacrilegious light. If they had approached the balustrade of the altar, they would have had to make their way through the prostrate crowd, consisting for the most part of strangers and pilgrims, who resorted to the city on the vigil of the feast; and who already felt the strong intoxication of fanaticism, and perhaps of wine. Their devout kisses were imprinted on the walls and pavement of the sacred edifice; and their fervent prayers were directed, whatever might be the language of their Church, to the bones, the blood, or the ashes, of the saint. . . . Whenever they undertook any distant or dangerous journey, they requested that the holy martyrs would be their guides and protectors on the road; and if they returned without having experienced any misfortune, they again hastened to the tombs of the martyrs to celebrate, with grateful thanksgivings, their obligations to the memory and relics of those heavenly patrons. The walls were hung round with symbols of the favours they had received; eyes, and hands, and feet, of gold and silver; and edifying pictures, which could not long escape the abuse of indiscreet or idolatrous devotion, represented the image, the attributes, and the miracles, of the tutelar saint."

Such was the semi-Pagan worship carried on in the Christian Church in the fifth century.

In the beginning of this age died St. Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, who lived in the reign of Theodosius. He has left us copious and instructive details of the state of society in his capital and country at that period. In delineating its corruption, he also inveighs against the luxury of the times, and especially the dress of females, which he describes. He represents the stage as obscene and abominable, and tells us of rope-dancers, balancers, etc.; so that those who have read Kingsley's wonderful historic romance, "*Hypatia*," will at once perceive the source whence the author obtained some of his facts. Moreover, he censures the manner in which marriages were celebrated—the hymns which were sung in honour of Venus! the indecent plays which were exhibited to the guests, and the introduction of other abominations which were offensive, not to Christians only, but to the very Heathen themselves.

St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt, comes a little after Chrysostom, and died A.D. 444. This saint was a remarkable man, and one who pushed his pretensions of priestly power to the utmost degree. His letters show the height to which the episcopal power aspired before the religion of Christ had become that of the Roman Empire. He demands implicit obedience for the priest of

(To be Continued.)